

B. North, LL.D., finished the tenth year of his pastorate.

The services consisted of a commemorative sermon in the morning, and an historical sketch in the evening by the pastor, with special music by the choir. Three of the hymns were written for the occasion.

Rev. Joseph B. North came to this pastorate in 1899 from Garden Memorial Church, Anacostia, D. C., and before that had been the pastor of the church in Kingfisher, Oklahoma. He has twice been elected Moderator of the Presbytery of New Castle, and is recognized



Manse of the Makemie Presbyterian Church.

as an authority on ecclesiastical law. His pastorate here, where he is greatly beloved, is the longest of any in the last one hundred years.

On the 27th of January his parishioners gave him a pleasant surprise, and presented him with a purse well filled with gold.

### THE NEW THEOLOGY.

By Rev. H. W. Burwell.

The more we read from the published utterances of those who speak with authority upon this subject, the more we have confusion the worse confounded. That which one will declare to be fundamental will be either trimmed beyond recognition, or emphatically denied by another. The principles which it is sought to establish have never been crystallized into anything that could be dignified with the title of "a system," and the very best that now can be said about it is that it is a movement, or propaganda, having for its purpose the replacement of the time-honored truths of Christianity by the so-called "assured results" of the destructive criticism, a conglomeration of conflicting theories and notions which, whatever it is or may become, is not and can never be truthfully called Christian. Its advocates talk a great deal and write more. They bring to their help the most beautiful and high-sounding phrases. But though they may garnish their pathway with the most choice specimens of linguistic flora in an attempt to cover its emptiness, the flowers wither and their perfume degenerates into a sickening, deadly stench

whenever the anxious, yearning soul has cried out for God and His saving truth. The real character of this new theology can be better understood when we study its teaching upon those truths which have always been fundamental to our Christian belief.

#### Its Teaching Concerning God.

A few years ago Dr. Lyman Abbott, speaking before one of our great universities, defined God as "a force." Dr. R. J. Campbell, the self-appointed high priest of the New Theology, declares, "The New Theology, in common with the whole scientific world, believes that the finite universe is one aspect or expression of God, but it thinks of it or him as consciousness rather than a blind force, thereby differing from some scientists." Dr. Campbell is more than welcome to the credit due for any modicum of truth or logical consistency to be found in that sentence. Starting with the sweeping declaration that the New Theology believes in common with the whole scientific world, he closes with the acknowledgment that they differ from some scientists. I suppose that this latter class are not included in Dr. Campbell's scientific world.

But far more serious is the fact that for this new teacher of men, God is either "it or him,"—not exactly a blind force, but at best only consciousness. And yet he professes to believe in the Trinity. What kind of a Trinity? He first assumes an infinite space filled with matter, then proceeds to divide it up. Through this division he secures the finite which is the second form or part of his trinity. His third division is derived from Haeckel's explanation of the Cosmic process by taking it for granted that the "infinite is pressing in and up through the finite." Thus for the answer, "There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost," we are asked to substitute, "There are three terms, modes, or phases in the it or him, the infinite, the finite and the activities of the former in and up through the latter." Starting with the assumption that the universe is God's thought concerning himself, he declares, "As far as I am able to think it along with Him, I and my Father (even metaphysically speaking), are one."

This, then, is the God whom, "in common with the whole scientific world," they would have us worship as a worthy substitute for the one living and true Deity who has uncovered, for the illumination and betterment of mankind, the glory of his grace, the wonders of his love and the bounty of his providence! For the triune, personal, saving God they would give us an empty "it or him" who, at best, is nothing more than consciousness.

With what lofty gusto do they proclaim this as scientific! It may be science, but only such as that which Mrs. Mary B. G. Eddy endorses in her question, "Is God a person?" Glibly answering, "No, God is not a person; God is a principle."

On one occasion Dr. A. C. Dixon was invited to speak at a convention of this persuasion. Among the speakers was a lawyer who also figured as an up-to-date theologian. During his discourse he made this statement: "I worship the everlasting it." Dr. Dixon took as his subject, "The Simplicity of the Gospel," and sounded this note of warning, "Brethren, if many